

IT FURTHER APPEARING that Plaintiff’s new alleged basis for recusal stems from his allegation that the “Defendants are countersuing Plaintiff falsely claiming ‘Bradford’s aforementioned allegations against the Honorable Stanley Chesler’s staff and the Judge himself’

and ‘Plaintiff’s Filing a Tort Claims Notice against Judge Chesler’” (Pl. Motion ¶ 4) (typos in original) and that this Court and its staff “are now witnesses in this case for the Defendants, and you and your staff also now possess a vested interest and a conflict of interest in this case favoring the Defendants and against the Plaintiff” (Id. at ¶ 5)¹; and

IT FURTHER APPEARING that such allegations cannot objectively be said to “reveal such a high degree of favoritism or antagonism as to make fair judgment impossible” so as to warrant the Court’s recusal, U.S. v. Bertoli, 40 F.3d at 1412;²

IT IS on this 18th day of July, 2005, hereby

ORDERED that Plaintiff’s motion to recuse the Court from this matter is denied.

s/

Stanley R. Chesler, U.S.D.J.

¹ See Pl. Motion ¶ 7 (“Plaintiff submits this Motion for your recusal based upon the reasons in Paragraphs Four and Five of this Motion, as stated on Page Three, and based upon the First Notarized Affidavit Requesting Judge Stanley Chesler Proceed No Further in This Case.”)

² Plaintiff also claims that “research computer person William Malloy stated that [Don] DiFrancesco recommended Judge Chesler to a former job.” (Pl. Motion ¶ 3). However, to the best of the Court’s knowledge, Mr. DiFrancesco did not support the undersigned for the position of United States Magistrate Judge, or any other position of employment.